



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1904.

I. — *Historical Value of the Twelfth Chapter of Plutarch's
Life of Pericles.*

BY PROF. W. S. FERGUSON,

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

THE following is the substance of our chapter: That which alone remains, according to Plutarch, to bear witness to the ancient power of Greece is the 'offering of sacred edifices' made in the days of Pericles. Yet no proposal of that statesman was more severely criticised by his adversaries than that which outlined his building policy. They cried out ὡς ὁ μὲν δῆμος ἀδοξεῖ καὶ κακῶς ἀκούει τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χρήματα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκ Δήλου μεταγαγών, ἡ δ' ἔνεστιν αὐτῷ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκαλοῦντας εὐπρεπεστάτη τῶν προφάσεων, δείσαντα τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐκείθεν ἀνελέσθαι καὶ φυλάττειν ἐν ὀχυρῷ τὰ κοινά, ταύτην ἀνῆρκε Περικλῆς· καὶ δοκεῖ δεινὴν ὕβριν ἡ Ἑλλὰς ὑβρίζεσθαι καὶ τυραννείσθαι περιφανῶς, ὁρώσα τοῖς εἰσφερομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἡμᾶς τὴν πόλιν καταχρυσοῦντας καὶ καλλωπίζοντας ὥσπερ ἀλαζόνα γυναικα, περιπτομένην λίθους πολυτελεῖς καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ ναοὺς χιλιοταλάντους. Whereupon Pericles made the following defence: "We owe the allies," he said, "no account of the funds, so long as we fight for them and protect them from the Persians, while they contribute neither horse, ship, nor hoplite, but money alone. What they pay belongs not to the givers, but to the receivers, provided these perform what they receive it for; δεῖ δὲ (he continued) τῆς πόλεως κατε-

σκευασμένης ἱκανῶς τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον, εἰς ταῦτα τὴν εὐπορίαν τρέπειν αὐτῆς, ἀφ' ὧν δόξα μὲν γενομένων αἰδῖος, εὐπορία δὲ γινομένων ἐτοιμία παρέσται, παντοδαπῆς ἐργασίας φανείσης καὶ ποικίλων χρειῶν, αἱ πᾶσαν μὲν τέχνην ἐγείρουσαι, πᾶσαν δὲ χεῖρα κινουῦσαι, σχεδὸν ὅλην ποιοῦσιν ἔμμισθον τὴν πόλιν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἅμα κοσμουμένην καὶ τρεφομένην."

Pericles' phrase — "distribute wages to practically the whole city" — is explained¹ by the observation that wages were already paid to men of military age and strength for service in the army, navy, and garrisons, and by calling attention to the diversity and extent of the interests involved in the construction of statues and temples. "The materials used were marble, bronze, ivory, gold, ebony, cypress-wood: the arts which put them into shape and place engaged carpenters, moulders in clay and bronze, stone-cutters, stainers of gold and softeners of ivory, painters, enamellers, and engravers: those that were concerned in furnishing and transporting the materials were, on the sea, merchants, sailors, pilots; on the land, wheelwrights, ox-breeders, teamsters, rope-makers, weavers, leather-dressers, road-makers, and miners. And each art, like a general with his army, had under it its mob of day-laborers and unskilled workmen — an instrument and body, as it were, for the service." As a matter of fact, concludes Plutarch, the result was the *εὐπορία*, or material well-being of the whole state.

There are difficulties of interpretation in the passage, but they do not affect the general sense, and need not be discussed here. It is to the historical value of the subject-matter that we are to devote our attention.

To determine this it is necessary to inquire into the sources of Plutarch's knowledge. It may be stated at the outset that the controversy whether Plutarch based his several biographies upon older historical works, merely adding here and there a thought culled in the course of his desultory reading, or, not unlike modern scholars, used extracts made from

¹ Zu diesen Worten verhält sich was sich daran anschliesst über die Verwirklichung dieses Gedankens des Perikles, wie die Erklärung zum Texte. Sauppe, H., *Ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 499.

books of all kinds, of history, comedy, philosophy, romance, biography, travel, of speeches, decrees, etc., — this controversy, it should be said, has not much affected the conclusions hitherto reached in regard to the present passage. For it was recognized from the first that the kernel of Chapter XII, the debate between Pericles and his adversaries, was different in character from what preceded and followed it.¹ Hence even those who thought that the bulk of the *Life of Pericles* was taken from Theopompos, or some other historian, admitted for the debate a distinct source.

It will fairly summarize the work already done in the quest of this collateral source to say that three opinions have been entertained: 1st, that Plutarch used either the memoirs of Ion of Chios, or the book on Themistocles, Thucydides, and Pericles by Stesimbrotos of Thasos, both of whom are held to have recorded similar disputes between Athenian statesmen; 2d, that Plutarch used more or less rhetorical and imaginary speeches inserted by Ephoros into his *Universal History*, or by Theopompos into the excursus on demagogues appended to his *Philippica*; 3d, that Plutarch, or his immediate authority, used the work of Theopompos, but that Theopompos composed the speeches from materials derived in part from the reliable reports of Stesimbrotos or Ion; in part, and specifically in respect to the purpose of Pericles in inaugurating his building policy, from the partisan oligarchic pamphlet written, according to Professor U. von Wilamowitz² by Theramenes, according to Professor Dümmler³ by Critias, according to more conservative scholars⁴ by some unknown aristocrat, and used, alas! by Aristotle in his *Constitution of Athens*.

For the first of these views stood Sauppe,⁵ Oncken,⁶ Adolf Schmidt,⁷ and Dr. L. Holzapfel,⁸ the two former advocating Ion, the two latter Stesimbrotos. Positive proofs none of

¹ See Sauppe, *o.c.*, p. 498 ff.

² *Aristoteles u. Athen*, I., p. 165.

³ *Hermes*, 27 (1892), p. 260 ff.

⁴ Professors Meyer and Busolt, for example.

⁵ *o.c.*

⁶ *Staatslehre des Aristoteles*, II., p. 509 ff.

⁷ *Das perikleische Zeitalter*, II., p. 222 ff.

⁸ *Untersuchungen über d. Darstellung d. griech. Gesch. von 489 bis 413 vor Chr.*, p. 144 ff.

them has adduced. The general probability of such an origin was all they sought to make out.

For the second of these views stood Rühl,¹ Köhler,² and Professor Curt Wachsmuth.³ The most telling argument against a contemporary and in favor of a fourth-century source was made by Köhler, who claimed that the statement attributed to Pericles, that "the allies contributed neither horse, ship, nor hoplite, but money alone," contained too gross an error to have originated while the Athenian empire existed.

For the third of these views stands most notably Professor Busolt.⁴ The ultimate origin of the debate in contemporary reports of discussions which actually took place between Pericles and Thucydides, son of Melesias, he holds for self-evident. That Theopompos was concerned in the tradition of the material to Plutarch he argues from a number of causes⁵: 1. The appearance of redundant synonyms in this chapter of Plutarch betrays the style of Theopompos. 2. The error pointed out by Köhler is repeated in a portion of Plutarch's *Cimon* which probably originated in Theopompos. 3. The survival of ἡμᾶς in the attack of Pericles' adversaries shows that the composer of the indictment was one who identified himself with the aristocratic party in Athens.⁶ 4. The design of distributing wages to all Athenians, imputed to Pericles by both Aristotle and Plutarch, reveals the work of the oligarchic pamphleteer used by Aristotle and Theopompos.

At this point a new turn was given to our present inquiry by Professor Eduard Meyer's study of Plutarch's methods of writing biography.⁷ Professor Meyer, in his wonted catholic fashion, was the first to formulate the net results of modern investigations into Plutarch's sources for his *Lives* of Greeks.⁸

¹ *Jahrbücher für class. Philologie*, 1868, p. 670 ff.

² *Abhandlungen der berliner Akademie*, I., 2, p. 99.

³ *Stadt Athen in Alterthum*, I., p. 529, n. 2.

⁴ See *Griech. Gesch.* III. I, p. vii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 439, n. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 350, notes.

⁷ *Forsch. zur alten Geschichte*, II., pp. 22 ff., 65 ff.

⁸ Professor A. Gudeman in a similar summary made as early as 1889 (*Tr. A.P.A.* XX., p. 139 ff.), showed that Plutarch used biographical literature, not Livy, Sallust, Asinius Pollio, Cicero, for the *Lives* of Romans.

Plutarch used neither Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, Ephoros, nor Theopompos. Those who attempt to connect his work directly with that of these historians forget that in the course of four hundred years before Plutarch's time the material suited for biography had been collected and sifted by generations and generations of scholars, notably by the Alexandrians. All Plutarch did was to make over in each case one of the already existent biographies. In his *Vorlage* were the quotations, the citations, the documents, the discussions, the anecdotes, etc. Plutarch chose such material as pleased him, and gave it new written expression. The style is mainly his. Fortunately for the modern historian Plutarch is not responsible for the ideas, except where these are ethical and conjunctive. Nor is he the originator of the form in which his biographies are regularly set. This Professor Friederich Leo¹ has recently shown. The rules for biography were as well established as those for oratory. The type to which Plutarch conformed had been created centuries earlier, and, as Professor Leo has convincingly set forth, through the activity of the Peripatetic School of Philosophy. This being the case, it is obvious that, while the value of Plutarch's material is enhanced, the possibility of determining his sources is lessened.² To put the matter concisely, what likelihood is there that the style of Theopompos, of Thucydides, of the comic poets, can be detected in the twelfth chapter of his *Life of Pericles*? This has been repeatedly attempted. Thus Sauppe noticed in the comparison between Athens decking herself out with thousand-talent temples and a courtesan, a reminiscence of the trenchant phraseology of some comedian,³ while Professor Dümmler saw in it the contempt of an embittered oligarch.⁴ Thus Professor Busolt lays the many lax synonyms of the chapter to the charge of Theopompos,⁵—beyond all doubt erroneously, as Professor Wilamowitz's remark⁶ in confirmation

¹ *Die griech.-römische Biographie*, p. 146 ff.

² Cf. Professor Meyer, *o.c.*, p. 69.

⁴ *Hermes*, 27 (1892), p. 274.

⁶ *Griech. Lesebuch, Erläutgn.* I., p. 38.

³ *o.c.*, p. 500, note.

⁵ *o.c.*, p. 439, n. I.

of my own observation has convinced me, — and Professor Bruno Keil¹ finds in it a flavor of the fourth-century rhetoric. Professor Busolt, moreover, sees in the speech of Pericles words and phrases which point to conscious or unconscious imitation of Thucydides.² How far is it justifiable to dissect Plutarch in this fashion with stylistic instruments? It is not an entirely unwarranted procedure. That Professor Meyer grants. Plutarch had a fine appreciation for the effectiveness of an antique turn of thought, and no scruples against using it without acknowledgment. He had, of course, read his classics, such as Herodotus and Thucydides, and had a retentive memory for striking expressions. He found in his biographical authorities an abundance of quotations which he borrowed freely. His composition, however, is a web, not a patchwork. Hence thought, not style, must be the prime test of the derivation of passages in Plutarch.³

Let us apply this test anew to our chapter. There can be no doubt that if we establish the substantial correctness of Plutarch's narrative, we shall strengthen the contention that a reliable contemporary of Pericles was the biographer's ultimate authority, while that contention will be weakened, if not overthrown, as Köhler perceived, by the detection of considerable errors.

It should be observed, in the first place, that the adversaries of Pericles mentioned in the chapter are Thucydides, son of Melesias, and his party. That is clear from Chapters XI and XIV. Thucydides became the leader of the oligarchs at Athens after the death of Cimon in 449/8 B.C., and was influential till he was ostracized in 443. Thucydides, Plutarch tells us, pointed out the odium incurred by the transference of the treasury of the Confederacy from Delos, and, at the same time, impeached the building policy of Pericles. When it was held to be established that the treasury was transferred in 454, and the Parthenon, the first of the Periclean buildings, was begun in 447, it was apparently an inaccuracy on

¹ *Anonymus Argentinensis*, p. 32, n. 2.

² *o.c.*, p. 444, n. 1.

³ See also Professor Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, p. 222.

Plutarch's part that the two events are represented as jointly criticised by Thucydides. Nor did it seem reasonable that Pericles should be abused for the removal of the treasury, so long as we believed, on the authority of Theophrastos, whom Plutarch elsewhere quotes with approval,¹ that it was effected on the motion of the Samians. Now, however, thanks to the *Anonymus Argentinensis*,² we are better informed. In the first place we learn that ten years intervened between the adoption of the plan for the Parthenon and the beginning of its execution in 447. Inasmuch as we had learned before that the temple of Niké Apteros was decreed apparently in or about 450,³ it is clear that the building policy of Pericles was under discussion earlier than 447. Hence, even if the transfer of the treasury was made in 454, as Professor Eduard Meyer⁴ and others still maintain, it would not be objectionable that the two events should be associated by Plutarch. It would indeed be awkward to suppose Thucydides in a position to lodge an indictment against them in that year. Hence it must be regarded as a pleasant confirmation of Plutarch to observe that the *Anonymus Argentinensis*, by which alone a date is assigned to the occurrence, sets the transfer of the treasury in 450/49,⁵ *i.e.* just at the time we should infer from Plutarch that Thucydides organized his party in opposition to Pericles. And it is equally reassuring to find, as we do from this same document, that Pericles, after all, not Samos, was responsible for the transfer.

How, in the second place, does it stand with the inaccuracy detected by Köhler in the statement that "the allies contributed neither horse, ship, nor hoplite, but money alone"?

¹ *Aristides*, 25.

² Edited by Professor Bruno Keil, Strassburg, 1902.

³ Professor W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*², No. 911. ⁴ *Gesch. d. Alter. V.*, p. vi.

⁵ Mr. Underhill, in the *English Historical Review*, 1903, p. 760, denies that the reference in the *Anonymus* is to the transfer of the treasury from Delos. He reminds us that Δή(λ)ψ is a modern conjecture for δῆμψ in the papyrus, which, in turn, is a correction made in antiquity for the original δῆμμ. That is true. But the conjecture is no doubt right. In what other connection could the assessment of Aristides and the enormous sum of five thousand talents have been mentioned? Professor Meyer, *l.c.*, calls the date of the *Anonymus*, 450/49, *völlig unmöglich*. But he gives no good reason for his judgment. Professor Keil's argumentation, *o.c.*, p. 116 ff., seems to me sound.

Did the allies who paid tribute furnish either horse, ship, or hoplite for the defence of the confederacy? That is the question, as Dr. Holzapfel¹ pointed out years ago. It is not universally answered in the affirmative even yet.² But granted that they did, as seems to me probable, the error is not a positive one. It is simply an exaggeration of the truth; for it is certain that the Athenians performed the bulk of the military service themselves, and rarely employed the land forces of the tributary allies. Therefore, an epitomizer might well think he had presented, in what we possess, the essential content of the statement, even if he omitted the reservations with which it had, perhaps, been originally accompanied.³

Next, let us ask the questions: Was the calculation that the construction of statues and public buildings would distribute wages to practically the whole city a reasonable one for a statesman like Pericles to make? Was it such as a party leader like Pericles would publicly announce?

It is the prevalent opinion that Athens in the fifth century had gone fully over to a capitalistic development of industry. Thus, for example, Professor Eduard Meyer says:⁴ "In Wirklichkeit steht Athen im fünften und vierten Jahrhundert ebenso sehr unter dem Zeichen des Capitalismus wie England seit dem achtzehnten und Deutschland seit dem neunzehnten Jahrhundert." Many apparently free handicraftsmen the capitalists had reduced to economic dependence upon themselves. Such as otherwise might have withstood the competition of the factory were being destroyed by the competition of the metics, upon whom the military and political tasks fell

¹ *o.c.*, p. 150.

² See Professor Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alter.* IV. 409 A.

³ See *Ibid.* 407 A. Professor Bruno Keil, who grants that the inaccuracy exists (*o.c.*, p. 32 n.), writes at p. 158: "Wenn die Oligarchen in Athen und von aussen die Bündner schriegen dass Perikles den Bundesschatz nicht für Bundeszwecke verwende und Athen mit fremdem Gelde wie eine Dirne putze: auf diese Massregeln [addition to the fleet, reorganization of the cavalry, etc.] liess sich hinweisen, auf sie hin behaupten, dass Athen gewappnet dastehe, jeder Zeit bereit das Schwert zu ziehen *für die Bündner die nicht Schiff, nicht Mann, nicht Ross im Kampfe wagten.*"

⁴ *Gesch. d. Alter.* III., § 303 A.

less heavily, and whom, as being less pretentious, the capitalists favored in distributing work. And, moreover, the capitalists imported slaves to make labor still cheaper. By means of slaves they worked the mines, ran the factories, and even pushed the free handicraftsmen from their tiny shops. Now, if that was the case, it would have been natural for such a regular business as building at the time of Pericles to fall entirely into the hands of wealthy contractors, who would, of course, have employed slaves and metics rather than citizens. And if this was the issue, state subvention of building enterprises would have been to the detriment rather than to the advantage of the ὄχλος, or mob of Athenian citizens.¹ As it is hardly conceivable that Pericles sought to promote the interests of the capitalists alone, or that by ὄχλος is meant the alien population, we cannot, in the premises, think that Plutarch is right in attributing to Pericles economic as well as ideal ends.

But was industry capitalistically organized in the fifth and fourth centuries? M. Francotte,² by a very careful collection and arrangement of the evidence, has made it clear, to me at least, that it was not. The irregularity of the foreign demand, due to the incessant wars, made factory production unprofitable, especially when slaves were employed. For even though they were stimulated by the receipt of living wages to the hope of some day purchasing their freedom, and hence worked quite as well as free men, slaves remained a dead weight upon the shoulders of their employer, whenever war interrupted business. The local demand required factory production no more then than it does now. Hence the forge as distinguished from the factory maintained itself as the characteristic form of industrial life.

¹ When capitalists imported slaves *en masse* for agricultural purposes they were strongly opposed; see the story of Mnason in Timaeus, *Fr.* 67 (Athenaeus, VI. 264 c = 272 b). Is it to be supposed that the industrial classes favored a policy which must have caused (in the premises) an extensive importation of slaves?

² *L'industrie dans la grèce ancienne* (*Bibliothèque de la faculté de philosophie de l'université de Liège. Fasc. VII. et VIII., 1900, 1901*); see also Dr. Friederich Cauer in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* XXIV. (1904), p. 78 f.

But who ran the forges and the similar work places? In the case of the building trades we are able to give an answer for the last years of the fifth and for the fourth century B.C. I quote from M. Francotte,¹ who has compiled the statistics of the subject. Among those whom the inscriptions show to have earned money on the Erechtheion in 409 and the following year were 24 Athenians, 40 metics, 17 slaves, and 21 whose status is doubtful, but who were mostly either slaves or metics. Among those whom the inscriptions show to have been paid for services in connection with the temple and portico at Eleusis during the last third of the fourth century were 36 Athenians, 39 metics, 12 foreigners, and 57 of doubtful status, but who were probably metics. In this case the state, *i.e.* the temple, owned 17 slaves, who were regularly employed and, like other workmen, paid for their labor. It is possible that private slaves were employed also, but their number is not determinable. From these statistics it is clear that from 409 to 309 the citizens received much less of the money disbursed by the state for its public buildings than did non-citizens. Was the same true for the time of Pericles? I do not think that, if we disregard the present passage, we have the means of answering this question definitely. But it must not be forgotten that the payments made for public services in the last half of the fifth and in the fourth century alienated from industrial occupations many citizens who, before the time of Pericles, and at the time when his building policy was first proposed, gladly sought remunerative employment of any kind. In the fourth century Lysurgus notoriously spent money on public works. Yet he escaped the charge of seeking to provide work for poor constituents. Nor has Augustus or Hadrian been credited with economic motives. Pericles stands at the beginning of that long period during which paid labor was flouted. He belongs with Pisistratus and the enlightened despots of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.; but, more fortunate than they, he controlled tributary allies, and was thus enabled to disburse public funds

¹ *o.c.* VII., p. 205 ff.

to Athenian citizens without increasing the taxation of his constituents.

In the explanatory remarks¹ which are added to the contention of Pericles that wages would be distributed to practically all the citizens, we are told that all but the *βάνανσος ὄχλος* already received state aid for service in the navy, garrisons, and army. In Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*,² Aristides is made to predict that as a result of the Empire support will be furnished "to all, to some for service in the expeditions, to some for garrison duty, and to others for transacting the public affairs." And Aristotle appends a calculation from which it appears that during the thirty years' peace twenty thousand citizens obtained pay annually for these various services. Of the twenty thousand, the hoplites alone amount to twenty-five hundred. These were doing garrison duty. No other hoplites are specified, and Aristotle informs us that it was only when the Peloponnesian War broke out that the classes liable for hoplite duty regularly obtained pay.³ This contradiction proves at most exaggeration in Plutarch's report; for at an earlier time they may have been paid irregularly, just as the service was irregular, and certainly, if they did not get the usual wage of a drachma a day, they received the usual indemnity of three obols a day.⁴

In the words attributed by Plutarch to Pericles, not only is an economic purpose enunciated for the building policy, but the employment thereby afforded is represented as one of its laudable features. How admirably that harmonizes with the ideas imputed to Pericles by Thucydides when he makes him say :⁵ Πλουτῶ τε ἔργον μᾶλλον καιρῷ ἢ λόγον κόμπω χρώμεθα, καὶ τὸ πένεσθαι οὐχ ὁμολογεῖν τινι αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλὰ μὴ διαφεύγειν ἔργῳ αἰσχίον. "Ἐνι τε τοῖς αὐτοῖς οἰκείων ἅμα καὶ πολιτικῶν ἐπιμέλεια, καὶ ἑτέροις πρὸς ἔργα τετραμμένοις τὰ πολιτικὰ μὴ ἐνδεῶς γινῶναι. How little it accords with the creed enunciated by Plutarch himself in this same *Life of Pericles*⁶ that even a great artist's work — to say nothing of an artisan's —

¹ See above, p. 3, n. 1.

⁴ Professor Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* III. 1, p. 266.

² § 24.

⁵ Thucy. II. 40.

³ *Const. of Athens*, § 27, 2.

⁶ *Plut. Pericles*, 2.

reduced him to the level of a slave! In Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* neither the construction of buildings nor the despatch of cleruchies is mentioned among the measures employed by Pericles to better the condition of the masses. The latter, however, Aristotle recognized as a legitimate means of preserving a democracy, and he commended highly a similar procedure of the Carthaginians, but of the former (employment for wages on public works as distinct from setting individuals up in commerce or industry) he speaks as follows:¹ "We may find instances of this practice in the pyramids of Egypt, the votive offerings of the Cypselidae, the erection of the Olympieum by the Pisistratidae, and the great works of Polycrates at Samos, all of which have the same effect, viz., that the subjects are kept in constant occupation and poverty." Aristotle is here interpreting fourth-century Greek opinion.

It is to be noted that it is in the explanatory note in Plutarch that a motive similar to that which underlies the construction of public buildings is predicated of Pericles' policy of paying government officials. Therefore the two rest on different supports. Should the view that payment for office was Pericles' way of bribing the poor be false, and, as is commonly claimed, of oligarchic manufacture, no suspicion is thereby attached to the original statement to which it is appended.

The explanatory remarks continue with a list of the materials and professions employed in "the construction of the sacred offerings"—a list embodied in the narrative of practically all modern historians of Greece. Some parts of it, indeed, have sorely puzzled several of them. It is easy to see how buildings and statues called for carpenters, modellers of clay, bronze-moulders, stone-cutters, etc. But observe the stress laid upon the transport of materials. Observe, too, that there were concerned with it, on the sea, "merchants, sailors, pilots," but not ship-builders, sail-makers, etc.; on the land, "teamsters, ox-breeders, miners, rope-makers, weavers, leather-dressers," but also "wheelwrights and road-makers."

¹ *Politics*, VIII. 11 (Mr. Welldon's Trans.).

The distinction is intentionally made. But Curtius¹ does not correctly explain it by remarking that "the very transport of the materials was the occasion of great progress in mechanical science in that inventive age," etc. The true explanation is given by the inscriptions which deal with the construction of the portico and temple at Eleusis in the fourth century. From them it is clear that three processes were involved in the land transport.² 1. The construction of vehicles. 2. The building of roads. 3. The actual transport. Ships were already in existence. Pack animals, the ordinary means of carrying loads, and trails, the ordinary paths for these, needed to be replaced by stout wagons and level roads when immense blocks of marble had to be transported. The wagons were drawn by oxen, and we have records to show us how it took three days, thirty to forty teams, and as many teamsters to bring each drum for the columns from Mt. Pentelicus to Eleusis. Harness of leather, fastenings of great ropes—the undergirdings from the dockyards were sometimes used—employed leather-dressers and rope-makers; in fact, the state made payments of money directly to each and every class of craftsman in Plutarch's list. The payments, moreover, were made to the workmen—citizens, metics, and slaves—for day labor or for petty contracts. No considerable sum was disbursed to any one man, or for any one piece of work. The interests involved were thus precisely those enumerated by Plutarch. To be sure, this confirmation of Plutarch comes from the fourth century, but it holds good for the latter part of the fifth century also,³ and it is a fair inference that in the age of Pericles circumstances were in this respect not essentially different.

How did Plutarch come to know the building methods of the fifth and fourth century Athens? In the first place, it is quite likely that the whole explanatory note, to which the enumeration belongs, was part of the biographical apparatus

¹ *History of Greece*, II., p. 637.

² *C.I.A.* II., Add. 834 c; also 834 b and IV. 2, 834 b; see M. Francotte, *o.c.* VIII., p. 85 f.

³ See the inscriptions (*C.I.A.* I. 282, 322; IV. 1, p. 1, p. 74; I. 321, 324; IV. 1, p. 148, p. 38, 317^a, 331^b, 331^c) which deal with the Erechtheion.

which Plutarch used. It may have been appended to the debate from the fourth century on. Or did Plutarch simply observe how temples were erected in his own day, and thence infer the old-time methods?

This idea involves the conclusion that building remained practically unchanged during the interval of five hundred years or more. Is that true? In certain minor particulars alterations had taken place. Thus, whereas state officers (*ἐπιστάται*) had in the fifth century employed artisans at a daily wage, or given a small piece of work on contract, in Roman times the imperial or municipal officials made a contract with one or more contractors (*ἐργολάβοι*, *redemptores*), whom they held responsible under security for the money advanced them by the state and for the proper completion of the work.¹ It is difficult to say in what proportion citizens, freedmen, and slaves took part in the operations. It was no doubt different in different regions. It is clear, however, that all three classes performed industrial work under the Roman régime. They were organized in guilds (*collegia*), wherever they were present in sufficient numbers to make an organization worth while. The guilds, though made up of citizens, freedmen, and slaves, who worked individually at their trades, seem yet to have had a relatively large proportion of freedmen. The following list of the chief guilds engaged on the public buildings of Rome is given by M. Waltzing in his *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, vol. II., p. 115 ff.:—

Collegium fabrum = *Collegium fabrum tignariorum*. This included all concerned with building operations, and one existed in most of the chief towns of the empire. In Milan the guild had at one time twelve hundred members; in Rome as many as sixteen hundred. *Fabri* = *τέκτονες* in Plutarch.

Collegium dendrophorum — those who furnished and transported timber; lumber-dealers.

Collegium aerariorum fabrum = *χαλκοτύπτοι* in Plutarch — coppersmiths or bronzesmiths.

¹ See Professor Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*, p. 382 ff.

Collegium fabrum ferrarium — workers of iron and other metals.

Collegae marmorarii = λιθουργοί in Plutarch — workers in marble.

Mensores aedificorum — architects.

Collegium pavimentariorum — *paveurs*.

Collegium subaedianorum = μαλακτῆρες ἐλέφαντος — *ébé-nistes*.

Conleg. sectorum serrarium — stone-sawyers.

Collegium structorum — masons.

A complete list of the industrial guilds of the Romans can be found in M. Waltzing's work, Vol. IV., p. 1 ff. It includes : *Lapidarii* = λιθουργοί, *Cisiarii* = ἡνίοχοι, *Lignarii plostrarii* = ἀμαξοπηγοί, *Linarii* = λινουργοί, *Metallarii* = μεταλλεῖς, *Navicularii marini* = ναύκληροι καὶ ἔμποροι, *Nautae* = ναῦται, *Sutores* = σκυτοτόμοι. These are not specifically connected with public buildings, but undoubtedly were interested in their construction. Many artisans remained outside the guilds.¹

Plutarch, speaking of the Periclean age, says : ἐκάστη δὲ τέχνη, καθάπερ στρατηγὸς ἴδιον στράτευμα, τὸν θετικὸν ὄχλον καὶ ἰδιώτην συντεταγμένον εἶχεν. Aurelius Victor, speaking of Plutarch's age, tells us of the emperor Hadrian that *ad specimen legionum militarium fabros, perpendiculatores, architectos, genusque cunctum extruendorum moenium seu decorandorum in cohortes centuriaverat*. One cannot help thinking that the two writers had something similar in mind. Plutarch, of course, lived to see Hadrian revive the old glories of Athens, though he had written his *Pericles* before the revival began in 125 A.D.

In summary, it may be said that the debate between Pericles and his adversaries contains no substantial inaccuracies. On the other hand, not only does it reveal close knowledge of the issues raised by Thucydides in his campaign against Pericles, but it attributes to Pericles motives which could hardly have suggested themselves to another than a contem-

¹ Few guilds in fact existed in Greece proper ; see M. Francotte, *o.c.* VIII., p. 199 ff.

porary—motives unnatural even in the fourth century; for at that time it could hardly have been imputed as a virtue to a statesman that he sought to entice citizens into tasks which public opinion held to be unfit for them to perform, or that he aimed to give bread to poor citizens by offering them work without first having debarred metics and slave-owners from applying for it.¹ In the Greece of the fourth century the question seems to have been, not how carpenters, stone-masons, etc., could get work, but how cities could get enough artisans to construct their public buildings. The local supply did not suffice to complete insignificant edifices at Athens, to say nothing of small places like Delphi, Epidauros, Delos, Lebadea, etc. The explanatory note is different in character and origin. In part it betrays kinship with the dominant thought of the fourth century, in part it discloses careful observation of ancient building processes—nothing more.

¹ It is notorious that Athens welcomed metics; for the demand for foreign workmen, see M. Francotte, *o.c.* VII., p. 209 ff.